



DLA PIPER US LLP
P. O. BOX 9271
RESTON VA 20195

COPY MAILED

DEC 10 2007

In re Application of
George J. Matthews
Application No. 10/720,341
Filed: November 25, 2003
Attorney Docket No. 5377-002-27

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS
ON PETITION**

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed July 24, 2007, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely reply to the Final Office Action mailed December 12, 2006. A response was filed June 12, 2007 with a three month extension of time request, but by Advisory Action of June 22, 2007, petitioner was advised that the response did not place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Abandonment was mailed June 27, 2007.

Petitioner has submitted a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and an amendment as the submission required under 37 CFR 1.114.

This matter is being referred to Technology Center 3764 for processing of the RCE.

Telephone inquiries related to this decision should be directed to the undersigned Petitions Attorney at (571) 272-3212.

Patricia Faison-Ball
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions

¹Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).